

1. Site Name: Sauget Area 1	2. WA #: 47-5N60	3. State: IL
EPA Region V ARCS Work Assignment Completion Report (WACR)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall Technical Performance Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Management Evaluation	
Contractor: E&E		Contract Number: 68-W8-0086
Contractor Program Manager: Daniel Sewall		Phone: (312) 578-9243
Project Officer (PO): Steve Nathan		Phone: (312) 886-5496
Contracting Officer (CO): Peggy Hendrixson		Phone: (312) 886-6581
Work Assignment Manager (WAM): Leah Evison		Phone: (312) 886-4696
Performance Period From: 7/97 To: 4/98		
<p align="center">Contractor Performance Evaluation</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Marginally Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory </p>		
<p>Description of Activities: The contractor conducted planning activities, data gathering activities, and prepared deliverables which included technical maps and data summaries of all Sauget Area 1 and 2 subareas, a PRP database, and photomaps of property ownership for both Sauget areas.</p>		
<p>Overall Performance Evaluation: Overall performance for this work assignment was "exceeds expectations". The PRPs level of effort and staffing were exceptional, their technical data deliverables and photomaps were generally of very high quality and the PRP database deliverable and project planning was of acceptable quality.</p>		
<p>Unusual Problem/Occurences Affecting Contractor's Performance:</p> <p>Due to the imminent end of the ARCS contract, the contractor had an unusually short period in which to complete this complex and unpredictable work assignment.</p>		
Phase I Award Fee Available: \$5,342		Phase I Award Fee Paid \$0 (as of 3/98)
Phase II Available: \$5,342		
Phase II Recommended:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Less than Satisfactory: 0% Satisfactory: 1-30%
Recommended Size:	<input type="checkbox"/> 60% <input type="checkbox"/> (0-100)	Exceeded Expectations: 31-65% Outstanding: 66-100%
State Specific Reasons for Recommending Phase II Award (additional pages may be attached if necessary)		
Evaluator Signature:		Date:
Evaluation Criteria Score Sheet		
Project Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	
[Organizing (e.g. work plan development, data review); scheduling; budgeting]		

The PRPs initial work planning and budgeting was quite good considering the highly variable nature of the data. Because of the unpredictable nature of this work assignment (due to the unknow volume and nature of data gathered from various agencies and within EPA), scheduling and budgeting had to be revised rapidly within a very short period of time. The contractor stayed in good contact with the RPM this process.

Technical Competence & Innovation

5	4	X	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---

[Effectiveness of analysis; Meet plan goals; Expert testimony; Support COE/State/Enforcement; Adhere to Regs and procedures; Approach creativity/ingenuity]

The contractor was very effective in proposing graphical means of presenting the technical data summaries and the photomaps of property ownership which produced deliverables of high quality and even more useful than the RPM had anticipated. This involved gathering, reviewing and summarizing a gargantuan amount of data from multiple agencies, such as 100,000 pages of file information and 75,000 pages of microfiche. The contractor's creative use of photomaps for property information proved a very valuable suggestion to the agency which will prove useful in upcoming legal actions.

Schedule and Cost Control

5	4	3	X	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---

[Budget (hours & costs) maintenance; Priority schedule adjustments; Cost minimization]

Due to the unpredictably large volume of data gathered by the contractor, the schedule and cost needed to be adjusted several times during this short project. This was really unavoidable and couldn't have been foreseen by the contractor. Budget control was maintained as much as possible through use of lower grade personnel in some tasks.

Reporting

5	4	X	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---

[Timeliness of deliverables; Clarity; Thoroughness]

The technical deliverables were clear, generally thorough, and of high quality. The PRP database deliverable was of acceptable quality. Deliverables were delayed beyond the originally agreed-upon deadlines due to the unexpectedly large volume of data which was gathered by the contractor. The new deadlines were agreed-upon with EPA but unfortunately due to the imending end of the contract, did not allow much time for EPA review of draft documents. This was unavoidable by the contractor, who in fact made a tremendous effort to complete the project before the end of the contract (see below.)

Resource Utilization

5	X	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---

[Staffing; Subcontracting; Equipment; Travel, etc.]

The contractor showed exceptional committment to completion of this project in the time frame available by comitting a large number of staff from multiple offices to this project. This included a total of 22 persons of differing levels of technical ability. An appropriate level of expertise was used for various parts of the project. The project was coordinated very ably by the contractor's project manager, who kept good control of the overall flow of this very fast-paced project. Travel was minimized by combining purposed for trips.

Effort	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>					X					5	4	3	2	1
X															
5	4	3	2	1											
[Responsiveness; Mobilization; Day-to-day; Special situation (e.g. adverse/dangerous conditions)]															
<p>The contractor used truly exceptional effort to complete this project by the end of the contract period. The entire team of contracting staff working on the project appeared to work well together to meet final deliverable timeframes and evolving expectations of the Agency. The unexpectedly large volume of data reviewed by the contractor took a very high level of activity on the part of the contractor's staff to gather, organize and summarize into useful forms for the Agency. In addition, the contractor was able to ably supply an extra numbers of deliverables as requested by the Agency towards the end of the project.</p>															
To Be Filled Out by Project Officer Only															
Project Schedule and Cost Information (approx.)															
Final LOE:			Final Cost:												
Contractor Performance Evaluation by Project Officer			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>								5	4	3	2	1
5	4	3	2	1											
PO Phase II Recommendation:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Recommended Size:	<input type="text"/> 0-100%											
Phase II Available:			Phase II Recommended:												
Project Officer Assessment and Certification:															
Project Officer Signature:				Date:											